



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/726,266	11/30/2000	Steven L. Pratt	AUS9-2000-0486-USI	5203
35525	7590	05/04/2005		
IBM CORP (YA) C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC P.O. BOX 802333 DALLAS, TX 75380			EXAMINER LEE, PHILIP C	
			ART UNIT 2154	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 05/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/726,266

Applicant(s)

PRATT ET AL.

Examiner

Philip C. Lee

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 February 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-12, 15 and 18-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-12, 15 and 18-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

1. In view of the Appeal Brief filed on 2/26/05, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. New grounds of rejection are set forth below.
2. To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:
 - (1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,
 - (2) request reinstatement of the appeal.
3. If reinstatement of the appeal is requested, such request must be accompanied by a supplemental appeal brief, but no new amendments, affidavits (37 CFR 1.130, 1.131 or 1.132) or other evidence are permitted. See 37 CFR 1.193(b)(2).
4. Claims 1-3, 5-12, 15 and 18-28 are presented for examination.
5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. code not included in this office action can be found in a prior office action.
6. The amendment filed 7/8/04 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132(a) states that no amendment shall introduce new

matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: the amendment with limitation “wherein said given operating system requires that attachment of resources to said given computer be performed on said given computer”. According to the specification, page 8, line 30-page 9, line 11, it is not understood how the operating system (or in conjunction with a program) requires the attachment of resources be performed on the computer as claimed in claims 1 and 27. Does the operating system receive calls from a program to attach, to assign resources for the computer. If so, how does the operating system attach the resources [i.e. by transmitting a request for resources]. In addition, the written description in the specification on page 8, line 30-page 9, line 11, does not describe how does the “operating system requires” resources to be attached to a computer by a program as claimed in claim 18. [i.e. does the operating system calls the program to attach resources, or does the operating system receives calls from the program according to the specification on page 9, lines 4-5 to perform the attachment of resources].

7. Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 112

8. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

9. Claims 1, 18 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The written description in the specification on page 8, line 30-page 9, line 11, does not describe how an “operating system requires” that attachment of resources to a given computer be performed on the given computer. [i.e. does the operating system performs the attachment of resources for the computer?]

10. Claims 12 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- a. The following terms lack proper antecedent basis:
 - i. the client computer –claim 12.
- b. Claim language in the following claims is not clearly understood:
 - i. As per claim 27, lines 7-8, it is unclear how a “computer network” is configured to run on an operating system.

Art Unit: 2154

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claims 1-3, 6-9, 15, 18, 20-23 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Win et al, U.S. Patent 6,161,139 (hereinafter Win) in view of Rao, U.S. Patent 6,421,755 (hereinafter Rao)

13. Win was cited in the last office action.

14. As per claims 1, 18 and 27, Win taught the invention substantially as claimed for managing resources in a computer network, comprising:

defining the contents of a configuration file (i.e. creation of user profile by assigning role to users and resources) (col. 5, lines 27-33) for each network user (col. 12, lines 45-50; col. 15, lines 30-37);

receiving a login identification (e.g. user name and passwords) from a user (col. 9, lines 36-40) on a given computer (col. 4, lines 46-54);

matching (i.e. authenticating) the user identity (col. 9, lines 36-40) (e.g. user name and passwords) with said user configuration file (e.g. profile information comprised of information defining role of user) (col. 5, lines 27-32; col. 10, lines 27-35); and

in response to said matching step (i.e. in response to authenticating), executing a resource attachment program on said given computer to attach network resources to said given computer based on the user identity and the contents of said user configuration file (col. 17, line 65-col. 18, line 58; col. 11, lines 29-44; col. 13, lines 59-60; col. 23, line 35-37) (i.e. after the user is authenticated, resources are built and shown only to those user according to the identity of a user corresponding to the content of the user profile (e.g. role of user) , for example, any user having a role of “Sales Manager” will have access to “ National Sales Report” resources as defined in the user profile).

15. Win did not teach specifically detailing a computer uses an operating system that requires attachment of resources to a computer be perform on the computer. Rao taught a computer uses a given operating system, wherein said given operating system requires that attachment of resources to said given computer be performed on said given computer (col. 4, line 66-col. 5, line 6; col. 11, lines 3-20).

16. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Win and Rao because Rao’s teaching of a computer with an operating system that requires that attachment of resources to said given computer be performed on said given computer would improve the efficiency of resource allocation in Win’s system by allowing an operating system to controls the allocation and usage of resources for application running on a computer.

17. As per claims 2 and 15, Win and Rao taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 1 and 18 above. Win further taught wherein the contents of the configuration file are defined by a network administrator (col. 12, lines 45-50).

18. As per claim 3, Win and Rao taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1 above. Win further taught wherein the configuration file is stored on a network server (col. 12, lines 2-6; col. 16, lines 43-54; col. 23, lines 20-23).

19. As per claims 6 and 20, Win and Rao taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 1 and 18 above. Win further taught wherein the resource attachment program is stored on a network server (fig. 7; col. 12, lines 51-53).

20. As per claims 7 and 21, Win and Rao taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 1 and 18 above. Win further taught wherein the step of attaching resources to a client further comprises creating a record of all successfully attached resources (col. 13, lines 16-19; col. 23, lines 25-32).

21. As per claims 8 and 22, Win and Rao taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 7 and 21 above. Win further taught wherein the record is stored on the client (col. 13, lines 20-21; col. 23, lines 47-51).

22. As per claims 9 and 23, Win and Rao taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 7 and 21 above. Win further taught wherein the record is stored on a network server (col. 13, lines 21-23).

23. Claims 5 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Win and Rao in view of Woodruff, U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0210648 (hereinafter Woodruff).

24. As per claims 5 and 19, Win and Rao taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 1 and 18 above. Win and Rao did not teach wherein said resource attachment program is stored on the client computer. Woodruff taught wherein a resource attachment program is stored on the client computer (page 5, paragraph 51).

25. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Win, Rao and Woodruff because Woodruff's teaching of a resource attachment program stored on the client computer would increase the efficiency of Win's and Rao's systems by allowing programs such as resource attachment to be executed locally on a client thus reducing the traffic between the client and the server.

26. Claims 10, 24 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Win and Rao in view of Corn et al, U.S. Patent 5,781,738 (hereinafter Corn).

Art Unit: 2154

27. As per claims 10, 24 and 28, Win and Rao taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 1, 18 and 27 above. Win and Rao did not teach unattaching the resources when the user log out. Corn taught comprising:

receiving a log out command from the user and unattaching the attached resources (col. 3, lines 28-45).

28. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Win, Rao and Corn because Corn's teaching of unattaching the resources would increase the efficiency of Win's and Rao's systems by allowing the unattached resources to be shared with other user (col. 3, lines 32-33).

29. Claims 11 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Win and Rao in view of Hudson et al, U.S. Patent 6,055,637 (hereinafter Hudson).

30. Hudson was cited in the last office action.

31. As per claims 11 and 25, Win and Rao taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 7 and 21 above. Win and Rao did not teach deleting the record of attached resources when a user log out. Hudson taught comprising:

receiving a log out command from the user and deleting the record of attached resources (col. 7, lines 33-39; col. 5, lines 64-col. 6, lines 4).

Art Unit: 2154

32. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Win, Rao and Hudson because Hudson's teaching of deleting the record of attached resources would increase the security of Win's and Rao's systems by preventing another user from accessing the record of attached resources.

33. Claims 12 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Win and Rao in view of Brendel, U.S. Patent 6,182,139 (hereinafter Brendel).

34. As per claims 12 and 26, Win and Rao taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 1 and 18 above. Win and Rao did not teach the client computer uses the UNIX operating system. Brendel taught wherein the client computer uses the UNIX operating system (col. 15, lines 23-32).

35. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Win, Rao and Brendel because Brendel's teaching of using the UNIX operating system would increase the flexibility of Win's and Rao's systems by allowing the use of clients with different type of operating system according to the choice of the designer.

36. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3, 5-12, 15 and 18-28, filed 02/16/05, have been fully considered but are not deemed to be persuasive

37. In the argument applicant argued that

- (1) Win fail to teach defining the contents of a configuration file for each network user.
- (2) the prior arts do not show that the given operating system requires that attachment of network resources to a given computer.
- (3) Win does not teach that the resource attachment program is stored on a network server.
- (4) Win does not teach creating a record of all successfully attached resources.
- (5) Win doe not teach storing the record on a network server.
- (6) Hudson fails to teach receiving a logout command and deleting the record of attached resources.

38. In response to point (1), Win taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1 above comprising: defining the content of a configuration file of each network user (i.e. creation of user profile by assigning role to users) (col. 5, lines 27-33) for each network user (col. 12, lines 45-50; col. 15, lines 30-37).

39. In response to point (2), applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., that the given operating system requires that attachment of "network resources" to a given

Art Unit: 2154

computer) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). The claim recite that the given operating system requires that attachment of “resources” to a given computer (i.e., network resources and resources are interpreted as different type of resources). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). In addition, the written description in the specification does not explain how the given operating system “requires” that attachment of resources to a given computer. The specification on page 8, line 30-page 9, line 11 merely discusses an operating system coordinates and provides control of various components and an object oriented program may run in conjunction with the operating system. The specification does not describe how the operating system is related to process of attaching resources or requiring attachment of resources to a given computer.

40. In response to point (3), Win taught that the resource attachment program is stored on a network server (col. 11, lines 29-44; 412, fig. 4).

41. In response to point (4), Win taught creating a record of all successfully attached resources (col. 13, lines 16-19; col. 23, lines 25-32) (i.e., reports showing list of resources accessible to a user, it is inherent that only resources that are successfully attached can be accessible to a user).

Art Unit: 2154

42. In response to point (5), Win taught wherein the record is stored on a network server (col. 12, lines 45-50; col. 15, lines 30-37; col. 16, lines 43-54) (i.e., information defining a user is stored on the Registry Repository, which is part of the Registry Sever)

43. In response to point (6), Hudson taught receiving a logout command and deleting the record of attached resources (col. 7, lines 33-39) (i.e., deleting temporary credential token when a user logs off, wherein the temporary credential token includes assigned resource information).

CONCLUSION

44. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Beckman et al, U.S. Patent 6,604,198, disclosed an operating system for providing access to resources based on user identification.


Robrock, II, U.S. Patent 5,680,390, disclosed a method for a provisioning operating system assigning network resources needed by the customer.

45. A shortened statutory period for reply to this Office action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip C Lee whose telephone number is (571)272-3967. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM TO 5:30 PM

Art Unit: 2154

Monday to Thursday and every other Friday. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571)272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

P.L.


GLENTON B. BURGESS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100